



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,251	12/15/2000	Jeffrey B. Hardesty	DP-303833	1434
22851	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. M/C 480-410-202 PO BOX 5052 TROY, MI 48007			TRAN, HIEN THI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/738,251

Applicant(s)

HARDESTY ET AL.

Examiner

Hien Tran

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/23/05 & 8/29/05.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-30,33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-30,33 and 34 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: "64, 80, 84" (Fig. 4) (Note that these reference numerals have been deleted in the amendment filed 9/20/04). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 24-30, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

Art Unit: 1764

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, in claim 30, it is unclear as to where the newly added limitations are disclosed in the original specification. See claims 33-34 likewise.

Also in claim 33, line 2 it is unclear as to what is intended by "blind recess", and where the "bottom wall" is disclosed in the specification and drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 24-30, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kruger (EP 992,659 - corresponding to US 6,555,070) in view of "3M Interam Mat Product Guide", either Santiago et al (4,155,980) or Abthoff et al (4,145,394), and Smith et al (5,720,319).

Art Unit: 1764

With respect to claims 30, 24-26, Kruger discloses a catalytic converter comprising:
an exhaust manifold 212 comprising a manifold wall 223-226;
a catalytic converter shell 221; wherein a portion of shell 221 is disposed within the manifold wall 223-226 to form a gas tight seal; and
a catalyst substrate 242 disposed in said catalytic converter shell;
a mat support material disposed between the shell and the substrate (col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 12, lines 11-13, 32-35); and
a mat protection ring, a portion of the ring is disposed in the manifold wall and a second portion of the ring is in physical communication with the support material (see, for example, Fig. 8).

The apparatus of Kruger is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but fails to disclose whether the mat protection ring may penetrate the mat support material.

However, Santiago et al discloses the conventionality of providing a mat protection ring 5 penetrating the mat support material 2. Similar, Abthoff et al discloses the conventionality of providing a mat protection ring 8 penetrating the mat support material 5.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to alternately extend the mat protection ring so as to penetrate the mat support material as taught by Santiago et al or Abthoff et al in the apparatus of Kruger for providing both retention of the catalyst substrate and elastic support of the catalyst substrate, as such is conventional in the art and no cause for patentability here.

Art Unit: 1764

With respect to the specific thickness, the modified apparatus of Kruger is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but is silent as to the specific thickness of the manifold wall and the converter shell as claimed.

However, 3M Interam Mat Product Guide discloses the conventionality of providing a manifold wall having a thickness greater than that of the converter shell.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select an appropriate thickness for the manifold wall and the converter shell as taught by 3M Interam Mat Product Guide in the modified apparatus of Kruger on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice and since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, merely discovering the relative dimension involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Gardner v. TEC systems, Inc.* 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777.

With respect to claim 27 and the newly added limitation of “recess” in claims 30, 33-34, as discussed in the 112 rejection above, the newly added limitations introduce new matter.

Therefore, the difference between applicants’ claim carrier and that of the prior art cannot be identified by the specification of the instant application. As best understood, the modified apparatus of Kruger is substantially the same as that of the instant claim, but is silent as to whether the shell may be cast within the end of the wall instead of welding and forming recesses.

However, the language of the claim appears to be a product-by-process claim and when the patentability of a product-by-process claim is determined, the relevant inquiry is whether the product itself is patentable. *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972). If a product is the same as or would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art from a product of the prior art, the product is unpatentable even though the prior art product was

Art Unit: 1764

made by different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Since the product of the instant claim is substantial the same as that of Kruger, it is unpatentable even though the product of Kruger was made by different process, e.g. welding of Kruger versus casting of the instant claim.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself.

In any event, Smith et al shows the conventionality of utilize casting method in connecting the pieces of elements in the catalytic converter system including recesses in the wall thereof.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to alternately select an appropriate method to connect the parts of the device, such as casting with recesses as taught by Smith et al, in the modified apparatus of Kruger, for the known and expected results of obtaining the same results in connecting parts of the catalytic converter and such a modification would have involved a mere substitution of known equivalent methods. A substitution of known equivalent methods is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Note that since Kruger discloses provision of the inner shell, outer shell and protection ring, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a plurality of recesses to firmly connect all these parts with the manifold thereof.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate location for the recesses, on the basis of its

Art Unit: 1764

suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice and since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70).

With respect to claim 28, Kruger discloses a retaining feature for retention in said manifold including the bumps (note curved parts near the connection between the shell and the manifold wall).

With respect to claim 29, Kruger discloses that the shell and the manifold wall are made of steel.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate material for each of the converter shell and the manifold wall, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-30, 33-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 1764

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Usleman et al, Tanabe et al, Henry, and Shibata et al are cited for showing state of the art.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hien Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1454. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1454. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/738,251

Art Unit: 1764

Page 9

Hien Tran

Hien Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1764

HT